Department of Revenue

OFFICE Board of Revenue

STATION Madras

No. 2604

DESPATCHED
16 SEP 1939

A 2925/8

Dated 13-9-39

I. G. R. ESQ.

(SUBJECT.)

Welfare Officers - Poland - (v. Kanara) - Circular

Nitterdale Vge - Appointment - Remission

Mr Nanu Nittanjapa - his guardian Annamma





Board of Revenue.

CFLRS6-02

R·P05

A2975

In the ~~High Court of Judicature at Madras.~~

Revision Petition

No. ~~**of 193**~~ .

against

Proceedings of Collector of S.K. D.D.s. No. 7485/38.

~~O. S.~~ / ~~A. S.~~ **No.** **of 193** **on the file of the**

~~**Court of**~~ In Re appointment of Village Headman - Ni Hade Village Karkal Taluk. S. Kanara.

Aithappa minor by guardian ~~and Ref~~ Amma — *Appellants. Petitioners.*

Narna, nephew of Dhamanna — *Respondents.*

I / We Amma nephew of Lingappa ~~Aliya~~ for myself and on behalf of minor Aithappa ~~Appellants / Respondents~~ / Petitioners in the above Appeal / Petition do hereby appoint and retain

Mr. T. Krishna Rao,

Advocate of the High Court, to appear to for me / us in the above Appeal / Petition and to conduct and prosecute (or defend) the same and all proceeding that may be taken in respect of any application connected with same or any decree or order passed therein, including all applications for return of documents or the receipt of any moneys that may be payable to me / us in the said Appeal / Petition and also in appeals under Section 15 of the Letters Patent in applications or leave to appeal to His Mejesty in Council and in Review Petitions.

ಸಹಿ ಬಪ್ಪ ಮಕ್ಕಳ ತಂದೆ ಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪನ ಅಳಿಯ ಮಗಳ ಗಂಡ
ಅಮ್ಮ ಕುಲಾಲ

Executed before me this 24th day of June 1939, the contents of this Vakalat having been explained to the executant herein in..... who seemed to understand the same and signed his / her name or made his / her mark in my presence.

S3. Vasudeva Prabhu
Patail of Bantwal Kamba Village
24/6/39.

Accepted:

Counsel for *Appellant* (Petitioner)



BEFORE THE HONOURABLE THE BOARD OF REVENUE, MADRAS.

Revision Petition No. of 1939.

(Against the proceedings of the Collector of S. Kanara, dated 29-3-1939 in D.Dis. No. 7485/38, in Re: Appointment of Village Headman - Nittade village, Karkal Taluk, S. Kanara.)

Between:-

1. Minor Aithappa, nephew of Amma, by guardian Amma, nephew of Lingappa, Nittade village, Karkal Taluk.
2. Ammu, nephew of Lingappa, Deputy appointed by Revenue Divisional Officer, for the minor Aithappa.

Petitioners.

a n d

Narna, nephew of Dharmanna Potail, Nittade village. — Respondent.

The address of the petitioners for service is that of their Advocate Mr. T. Krishna Rao,'Shanti Bhavan' Brodies Road, Mylapore, Madras.

The humble petition of the petitioners abovenamed to this Hon'ble Board against the order of the District Collector of South Kanara dated 29-3-1939 in D.Dis. No. 7485 of 1939 in appeals against order of Revenue Divisional Officer, Coondapur in R.Dis. No. 4748/38, most respectfully showeth:-

1. One Narna, the respondent herein who was the permanent potail of Nittade village, filed a petition on 21-2-1938 offering his resignation on account of old age and requesting his son Jarappa to be appointed to his place claiming himself as the la

of an Aliyasanthana family.

2. The Tahsildar of the place made an elaborate inquiry and after hearing the objections of the petitione herein that Narna was not the last member of the family, that they are the members of the same family as himself, that minor Aithappa, the 1st petitioner herein has a superior claim for the post and after carefully reviewing the documentary and oral evidence adduced on their behali reported that Narna was not the last surviving member of the family, that Aithappa, minor, is the nearest relation and that Narna's son Jarappa has no claims whatsoever under the law governing the parties and that the 2nd peti tioner a distant member of the family may be appointed deputy during the minority of the minor.

3. Narna seeing that the report of the Tahsildar was against his contention, filed a petition on 17-9-1938 for permission to withdraw his resignation.

4. As Narna was in addition to old age also illit the Revenue Divisional Officer refused the permission to withdraw his resignation. He then elaborately went into the rival contentions of the parties and after examining in detail the oral and documentary evidence adduced on behalf of the parties, held that Narna is not the last member of the family and therefore Jarappa his son has no claims whatsoever to the post, that minor Aithappa the 1st petitioner and Ammu the 2nd petitioner belong to the family of Narna and that Aithappa has superior claims and in the result he registered minor Aithappa as the holder of the office and appointed Ammu the 2nd petit [redacted]ein as the deputy during the minority of Aithappa.

Cf 5. Against that order both Narna and his son Jarappa preferred appeals to the Collector of South Kanara.

6. The District Collector, ignoring the admiss of Narna and the importance of the documents filed by the petitioners and relied on by the Revenue Division Officer, remarked "that there is no definite or satis factory proof as to whether the last office holder Na has or has not any legal heirs, much less that the mi Aithappa who is alleged to be a member of his family is his next heir entitled to succeed him." In the result he held that the best solution would be to gra permission to Narna to withdraw his resignation and t reinstate him in office; he also dismissed Jarappa's appeal in so far as it related to his own claim.

7. Against that order of the District Collector the petitioners have preferred this revision petition to this Hon'ble Board.

8. The petitioners submit that the order of th Collector in the circumstances is one without jurisdi and not valid in law for the following grounds:-

(a) The Revenue Divisional Officer having refus to grant permission to Narna to withdraw, and having accepted, his resignation, the vacancy had occurred a the District Collector had no jurisdiction to proceed as if no vacancy had occurred at all by permitting Na

(b) Narna having sent up his resignation on account of old age setting up a claim in his son Jar and seeing that that object was going to be frustrat he having againx x filed a petition to permit him t withdraw his resignation, the District Collector oug to have held that there is no bonafides in his appli cation, and that he ought not to be permitted to app and reprobate.

(c) The District Collector is not justified in brushing aside the admitted fact that Narna in addit to old age is also illiterate.

(d) The District Collector acted illegally in granting permission to Narna to withdraw his resigna especially when the resignation was accepted by the Revenue Divisional Officer, the only officer competei to accept the resignation and as such when the resig tion has become final.

(e) The District Collector,acted without juris tion in refusing to decide the rights of the rival c to the office.

(f) The District Collector ought to have held the documents, viz:-

(i) District Gazette notification of 3-7- wherein Narna admits the existence of 4 members of his family besides his m and himself.

ii) The Tahakorar or the management deed 3-11-1912;

(iii) Notice issued by the Dharmatla "Sir Oracle" which shows that minor Aithappa is the son of Hukru a descendant of Narna's grandmother's sister;

(iv) The report of the Tahsildar.

all clearly establish that minor Aithappa and Narna are members of the same family. The District Collector erred in saying that those documents are not properly proved especially when that objection was not taken anywhere before either before the Tahsildar or before the Revenue Divisional Officer.

(g) The District Collector erred in saying that Hukru mentioned in the notice issued by the Dharmasthala is not identified as the same as the members of the family as shown in the genealogy. It was not disputed in the enquiry stage before the Tahsildar nor before the Revenue Divisional Officer that the Hukru therein mentioned is not the same or the member of the family. As a matter of fact the case proceeded on that admitted footing. Besides there is the oral evidence and the statement of Mankoc on 24-7-1937 in K.R.21/27, that this Hukru is the same as the one mentioned in the genealogy.

(h) The District Collector erred in countenancing in appeal for the first time objections of a technical nature which if they had been raised earlier could have been set right by adducing proofs of formal nature.

9. The second petitione

person and a distant member of the family of the holde and he was appointed deputy on the recommendation of t then guardian of the minor Aithappa.

The Petitioners therefore pray that in the circum stances stated above, this Hon'ble Board may be please to set aside the order of the District Collector of South Kanara dated 29-3-1939 and restore that of the Revenue Divisional Officer, Coondapur dated 29-10-1938

pp 11-17 cf

pp 19, 23 cf

M a d r a s,
27-6-1939.

Counsel for Petitioners.

Before the Hon'ble Board of
Revenue, Madras.

Revn. Petn. No. of 1939

against

D.Dis. No. 7485 of 1938
of Dt. Collector, S. Kanara.

Minor Aithappa and
another Petrs.

Vs.

Narna Respt.



11

D.Dis.No.7485/38.

Proceedings of the Collector of South Kanara, dated the 29th March 1939.

Khan Bahadur Sharif Ahmad Ali Sahib Bahadur, B.A.

Village Officers - Karkal Taluk - Nittade village - Headman - appointment - Appeals - Orders passed.

Appeal petition, dated 7.11.1938 of Jarappa son of Narna of Nittade village, Karkal Taluk, filed through M. K. Nambyar, Esq., Bar-at-Law.

Coondapoor Revenue Divisional Officer's N.Dis.7112/38, dated 9.11.1938 and the connected records.

Also petition, dated 25.11.1938 of Narna nephew of Dharmanna of Nittade village, filed through Sri S. Narsappaya Vakil, Mangalore.

Heard the parties through their Counsels.

This is an appeal against the order of Revenue Divisional Officer, Coondapoor, registering the minor, Aithappa (1st Respondent) for the office of the Potel of Nittade village with Ammu (2nd Respondent) as Deputy. The last office holder was one Narna a washerman by caste and he resigned in favour of his son, Jarappa (appellant) on the plea of ill health, in the hope that the latter who used to act for him off and on might succeed him in office. But the claim of the appellant was disputed by Ammu on behalf of the minor Aithappa who claimed to be the next legal heir by virtue of the Aliyasanthana Law governing succession in that community. The Revenue Divisional Officer found that the assertion of Narna, the last permanent office holder who resigned, that he had no legal heir living was not substantiated, and allowing the claim of the minor Aithappa that he was the next legal heir entitled to the office in accordance with Aliyasanthana, regis

appointed Ammu as Deputy on hi

2. The rival claimants rely on certain documents and genealogical trees filed by them which I shall now proceed to discuss. On the side of the appellant Jayappa three documents have been put in. The first is a registered Kararnama No.131, dated 11.3.1912 executed jointly by Seshu, her son and his cousin Ammu stating that as Ammu was too old to manage the family properties and as there were no other heirs, Narna (father of the appellant) should thenceforward manage the properties, get the registry transferred in his name and pay the assessment due on them. The second is a registered gift-deed No.183 dated 25.4.1928 executed by Narna (last office holder) in favour of Aithappa and his brothers making over to them some properties to meet the expenses connected with certain services and thirdly a registered deed No.585, dated 17.11.1937 executed by Narna in favour of his wife settling all his properties on her and the children as he was the last surviving member of the Aliya-santhana family. It is argued on behalf of the appellant that these documents constitute sufficient proof of the fact that there were no legal heirs left to Narna, for if there were any, they would have disputed the alienations of the property thus made by him, which however was not the case.

On the other hand the minor Aithappa bases his claim to the right of succession on two documents and some genealogical trees filed on his behalf by the Deputy Ammu. One of the ----- documents is a copy of the private notice published in South --- Kanara District Gazette, dated 3.7.1909 purporting to have been issued under the names of Narna and 4 others including Jaku, to the effect that one Ammu was trying to do them out of the ------ properties by incurring debts in order to give the assets of the family to his wife and children. Narna however denies that he was a signatory to this notice and there is nothing to show either that the Narna mentioned in the notice is identical with Narna (the last office holder and father of the appellant) or that even so he was a party to

oracle at Dharmastala temple, on behalf of Jaku and her daughter Hukru indicting Narna for not giving them ---- maintenance. Narna nevertheless contends that Jaku mentioned in the said notice claims to be the grand-daughter of Hukru while according to the genealogical tree filed by Ammu the deputy on behalf of the minor Aithappa (1st respondent), this Jaku is alleged to be the grand-daughter of Hagu. Little or no weight can therefore be attached to these genealogical tables.

It will thus be seen that though the Aliyasanthana Law of Succession is applicable in the present case, the documents filed in support of the rival claims are not only unilateral but also wholly inconclusive in regard to the issue. There is no definite or satisfactory proof as to whether the last office-holder Narna has or has not any legal heirs, much less that the minor Aithappa who is alleged to be a member of his family is his next heir entitled to succeed him. In these circumstances, it would appear that the Revenue Divisional Officer ~~xxx~~ was not justified in deciding the claim in favour of the 1st respondent and appointing him to the vacant office. All things considered the best solution would be to grant permission to Narna to withdraw the resignation tendered by him as prayed for and reinstate him in office. The reasons adduced by the Revenue Divisional Officer for not allowing him to resume office are not convincing. He is no doubt illiterate but this handicap obviously has not interfered with the efficient discharge of his duties as he has held the Patelship without giving any cause for complaint for the past 30 years and more. I have seen him and I consider that though he is rather old he is nevertheless physically and mentally quite fit to carry on for some years longer. I accordingly allow his petition and restore him to office. The appeal of Jarappa in so far as it relates to his own claim is however dismissed

(1) The appellant Jarappa son of Narna of Nittade through M.K.Nambyar Esq.,Bar-at-law,Mangalore.

(2) The Respondents Ammu and minor Aithappa through their Advocate Sri A.Laxminarayana Rao,B.A.B.L., Udipi.

(3) The appellant Narna nephew of Dharmanna of Nittade village through his vakil Sri S.Narsappaya of Mangalore.

y to the Revenue Divisional Officer, Coondapur, with records of his office R. Dis.4748/38 returned.

31.3.

R.Dis.4748/38.

Proceedings of the Revenue Divisional Officer, Coondapoor, dated 25th October 1938.

Sri Y. V. Subrahmanyam Pantulu, B.A., B.L.

Village Officers - Karkal Taluk - Hattade village - Hotel Karna - Resignation - Proposals to fill up the vacan Report - Orders passed.

28 OCT 1938

Read the following:-

1. Karkal Tahsildar's Lr.ref.'S-720-38/1-6-38.
2. Petition dated 6-6-38 from Sarappa.
3. Petition dated 12-6-38 ~~xxxx~~ and 17-6-38 from Hotel Karna.
4. This office proceedings ref. R.477-38/17-6-38.

Advocate for Sithappa and Minor, Heard Messrs. T. L. Narayana Rao, G. C. Nego and G. Somasheckara Rao, Vakils for Hotel Karna and Sarappa.

Order.

This is a case of disputed succession to the village Hotel's office of Hattade Village, and the contending parties are governed by Aliyasanthana law. Proceedings were started with the resignation of the permanent Hotel Karna, owing to old age, on 21-6-38. After Tahsildar's elaborate enquiry, which has ~~xxx~~ falsified Karna's contention that he is the last surviving member of the family, Karna filed a petition on 17-6-38 for permission to withdraw his resignation. This was not permitted as Karna was, in addition to old age, found to be illiterate. His resignation is therefore accepted.

The office is claimed by Sarappa, who though a son of Karna is not his heir, and also by minor Sithappa. Sarappa bases his claim on the ~~grand~~ dictum of his father that ~~there are no surviving heirs in the family, and on some~~ self-serving and unilateral documents created by Karna. The lengthy arguments of the learned Vakil for Sarappa are ~~xx~~ aimed partly at showing that Sarappa is well-fitted for the office, which is alleged not hereditary in the family, and partly to condemn ~~xxxxxxxxx~~ strong statements of some ~~xx~~ members belonging to the branches of the original family

1909 Narna admits 4 members of the family excluding his - mother, he does not state how the family has become extin and how the family properties in 4 villages have been dis posed of. It cannot be said that Narna, who wants the - appointment for his son Carappa is ignorant of the vici- situdes of the family, nor can he be said to have proved t. case for his son xxxx by his assertion.

2. On the other hand there are, in addition to ora evidence, documents to show that minor Aithappa is the - nearest heir to the last office holder, Narna.xxx Startwi there is the admitted notification in the District Gazett dated 6-7-1906 giving names among others the name of Jack who is the granddaughter of Mukru, who xx in turn is the senior maternal aunt of Narna's mother Gesu. This gazet notification was meant to protect the family properties fr being given away, on various pretexts, to wife and childr of Ammu, who was then the ejaman of the family. Within three years later, i.e., on 3-11-1912 Narna enters into a Tahakarar with Ammu, and gets the management without any reference to the other members of the family; and there nothing strange that this Narna, who is a clever and in- fluential person among a backward community, has been try to exclude other members of the family living in differen villages by sole enjoyment of property and by settlement deeds etc in favour of wife and children. In these cir- cumstances Jacku and her daughter Mukru approached the "Sir Oracle" at Dharmasthala for help. The notice dated 16-5-1922 issued on Holilu mentions Jacku and her daughter Mx Mukru. That Mukru has a son by name Aithappa is ---- evidenced by the extract from the

is seen from the local enquiry of the Tahsildar, the oral evidence, and the statement of Manku on 24-7-37 in K.R.21/4 on the file of the Deputy Tahsildar, Belthangady. Thus, there is a continuous chain of evidence to connect Aithappa the son of Mukru, with Jacku mentioned in the District --- Gazette notification.

Whatever may be the sympathy for Karna's natural --- desire, and his qualified son Jarappa, one cannot help --- obeying the law governing the parties. It is true xxx the appointments are not made on the basis of any Statute, but by long custom distant minor members of the last office --- holder governed by Aliyasantnana law are registered to the exclusion of the sons of the father. Aithappa is thus registered as minor patel of the village, and Ammu, who is qualified and nominated by the father of the minor, before death is appointed deputy during the non-age of the minor.

/ By order /

Head Clerk. 27 10 38

J.F.I/27-10.

To the Tahsildar ~~(with records)~~

Copy to Karna, Jarappa, Ammu and Aithappa (through the Tahr.)

R.Dis. 720-38

Forwarded to Ammu through the Revenue Inspector, Venur.

DRAFT FOR APPROVAL.

	Date.	Initials.
When received for fair copying ...	15/9	
When copied ...	15/9	
When examined...	16/9	
When signed ..		
When despatched.		

SUBJECT:— V. Os — Potail - (S. Kanara) - Karkal Taluk - Nittade Vge - Appointment - Revision Petn by Minor Nittappa by guardian Amma — orders passed.

READ AGAIN _____, dated _____ 19____.

" " _____ " _____ 19____.

READ *ALSO*:—

3 cf No. A 2475/38 From the Petns' Counsel, No. - , dated 27.6.19 38

11. cf " S. Kanara Coll's order D.Dis 7485/38 29.3.19 38 } Q.

" _____ " _____ " _____ " _____ 19____.

~~Order~~ / Resolution ~~Ms.~~ / ~~Rout.~~ No. 2604, dated 13.9.19 39.

PC 11 - 17 cf

PP 9 - 23 cf

This is a revision petn by Minor Nittappa against the order of the Coll^r of S. Kanara No. D.Dis 7485/38 d. 29.3.39, setting aside that of the R.D.O. Coondapoor No. R.Dis 4748/38 d. 25.10.38 requisitioning the said mind for the Potails office of Nittade Vge in the Karkal Tk, S. Kanara dt.

15 Sav 13/9/39

law and so the R.D.O. ignored the claims of Nanna's son Jarappa and registered the petitioner, minor Bitthappa for the Office, as being the nearest heir to (Nanna under the said law.) Nanna and Jarappa appealed to the Colr who allowed the former to withdraw his resignation and resume his Office, as a "solution" to the problem that arose Consequent on a dispute between Nanna and Bitthappa regarding their claims to the Office based on kinship. The Colr dismissed the Jarappa appeal. The present revision petn is against the Colr's order allowing Nanna to assume Office.

and resume the office which he resigned is correct. The Board's view on the question from time to time has been that when a village officer resigns office, he does so finally once and for all, & all his claims to it ~~that being so, the Collr's action in not~~ ~~according to the Board's rulings. It was the Board therefore~~ The Board accordingly sets aside the Collr's order No DDis 7405/38 d 29.3.39 and directs that the claims of the parties be disposed of on merits.

Ack
8.9.39.
KV
8.9.39

Ack
9.9.39

To Sri. V. Krishna Rao.
Advocate
'Shanti Bhavan'
Brodies Rd. Mylapore
Mds

A 2975/34

20,002—10-10-38.

PETITION NOTE FILE.

SUBJECT— Village Offices - Potail - (S. Kanara) - Karkal Tq
Nittade village - Appointment - Revision Petn -
Minor Bithappa by guardian Ammu

DATE OF RECEIPT.— 3. 1. 39.

NOTE.—If the answer to any of the questions noted below admits of a simple and direct answer, this answer should be noted against the question. Where the answer is in doubt and requires discussion and orders, the words "see below" should be entered instead and the question dealt with in the body of the Office note, under the numbered heading which will be repeated for the purpose

1. Nature of Petition? (Original, appeal, or revision.) — Revision.

2. Under what statute, law or other provision, is it preferred? — Please see under item (4) below.

3. In cases of appeal or revision—Authority on which original (and lower appellate) orders were passed. — R.D.O. B.S.O. 156 (2) P 870
Collr. " 156 (3) 15 5

5. *Stamps* (Quote authority in every case).

(*a*) Is the petition with enclosures properly stamped ? Yes — B.S.O. 172 (10) Appendix Rule XI (2) (P 1069, BSO VII) ✓

(*b*) If exempt from stamp duty, state authority. does not arise.

6. *Limitation*—

(*a*) Is the petition in time—State time allowed—With authority ? Yes. 3 months' time allowed. B.S.O. 172 (10) Appendix XIV Rule P. 1068. BSO VII IV

(*b*) If the petition is time-barred—
I. Is there authority to condone delay ? does not arise.

— PP 11-15 C.F.
Collr's order d. 29.3.39
Petn dtd 1.4.39
Recd 1.7.39
" 29.6.39
P 1 C.F.

II. If so, state here any grounds adduced for condonation. Nil

M 3

AS (Coll)

A. S. (C. R)

-8 CF

This is a revision petition by Minor Bittappa, against the S. Kanara Coll's order setting aside that of the R. D. O. Coondapoor registering the said minor for the Patail's (headman's) office of Vittade village with Amma as deputy for him. In his order the Coll has also allowed Narna the last office holder, who resigned office and thus caused the present vacancy, to withdraw his resignation and resume office.

PP 11-17 CF

PP 19-23 CF

P. 15 CF.

2/. Village offices in the S. Kanara district are nominally non-hereditary and non-tatinary but, by virtue of long usage and custom, the principles of hereditary succession including the registry of minors with deputies are strictly followed – vide discussion in R. P. No 3857 of 13.12.37. And with these principles, the other incidental rules are also observed in the district.

P 6. (A)

(A)

Mr. Anantha Iyer at 9. N. F. (E) = 1489 of 31.5.38)

3/. In the present case,

which one's sister's son, to the exc
one's
~~his~~ own son, is recognised as the
nearest heir and allowed to succ
~~him~~. Accordingly the R.D.O. ignor
the claims of Nanna's son Jarap
and registered the petitioner Mino
Kittappa for the office as being the
nearest heir to Nanna, under the
said Law. Nanna and Jarappa
appealed to the Colln., who allowed
the former to withdraw his resignatio
and resume office, as a "solution" to
the problem that arose consequent
the dispute between Nanna and Kitta
regarding their claims to the office bas
on kinship. The Colln dismissed Jarap
appeal. The present revision petn is
against the Colln's order allowing Nan
to resume office

4/ The only point for
consideration by the Board is, whether
the Colln's action in having allowed/le
withdraw his resignation and resu

claims to it. This means that he cannot be reappointed to it under any circumstances. This view of the Board has also been re-affirmed in many of its subsequent proceedings. That being so, the R.D.C. order refusing to allow Narma to withdraw his resignation and resume office is in accordance with the Board's considered views and rulings, where the Coll's order in question is not ~~the Coll's order not being in accord with the Board's rulings is thus liable to be set aside~~. For order

Oly
5.8.39.
WS
11.8.39

The Collector's orders may be set aside & he may be asked to dispose of the appeal on merits

WS
21.8.39

N

AS(LA)

Mis 2604

Single member

Dated 13.9.39

Two Members

Full Board.

I-A.	A.D.S. & L.R.	Asst. Secretary. Land Rev.	Sett.	Sep. Rev.	J.S.	S.	M 4	M 3	M 2	M 1

. Open file seen by ✓ ✓

. Final draft seen by ✓

. Now circulated to.

. Initials.

Passed for record.

Secretary.
Joint Secretary.

~~A.S. (C.W.)~~

A.S. (L.R.) 14/9/39

A.S. (Sett.)

A.S. (Excise)

A.D.S. & L.R.

I.A.

14.9.39

ote:- Entries not required to be scored out.

AS(LA)

Ms 2604 Single member

Dated 13.9.38 ~~Two~~ Members

~~Full Board.~~

I-A.	A.D.S. & L.R.	Asst. Secretary. Land Rev.	Sett.	Sep. Rev.	J.S.	S.	M 4	M 3	M 2	M 1

---

1. Open file seen by

2. Final draft seen by

3. Now circulated to.

4. Initials.

Passed for record.

~~Secretary.~~
~~Joint Secretary.~~

~~A.S. (C.W.)~~

A.S. (L.R.)

A.S. (Sett.)

A.S. (Excise)

A.D.S. & L.R.

I.A.

Note:- Entries not required to be scored out.